



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,021	03/30/2004	Timothy S. Farlow	12579-0006001	1009
26161 7590 01/09/2009 FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER CARDENAS NAVIA, JAIME F				
ART UNIT 3624		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 01/09/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/815,021

Applicant(s)

FARLOW ET AL.

Examiner

Jaime Cardenas-Navia

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. This **FINAL** office action is in response to communications received on September 16, 2008. Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 14-21, 23-25, and 31-33 have been amended. No new claims have been added. Claims 1-33 are currently pending.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's new drawings are **sufficient to overcome the objections to the drawings** as set forth in the previous office action.
3. Applicant's amendments to the specification are **sufficient to overcome the objections to the specification** as set forth in the previous office action.
4. Applicant's amendments to the claims are **sufficient to overcome the objections to the claims** as set forth in the previous office action.
5. Applicant's amendments to the claims are **NOT sufficient to overcome all the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections** as set forth in the previous office action. Grounds of rejection are stated below.

6. Applicant's amendments to the claims are **sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections** set forth in the previous office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. **Claim 21 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 21, "like" is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. The term is not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Examiner suggests that Applicant claim specific attributes that the interfaces share or remove the similarity language from the claim. For purposes of examination, "like" has been interpreted as having at least one commonality.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered by the Examiner. In particular, Applicant argues regarding independent claims 1, 17, and 18 that (1) Loofbourrow does not teach or suggest enabling the manager, through the user interface, to implement management tasks for events that are associated with the presented portion of information. Regarding independent claims 19, 23, and 24, Applicant argues that (2) Cunningham does not teach or

suggest that a portion of the authored content is displayed on a hardware display device when the manager is currently working on one of the events associated with the portion of the authored content. Regarding independent claims 25, 31, and 33, Applicant argues that (3) Cunningham does not teach or suggest deriving a statistical measure of usage of particular information about the policies or programs. Regarding independent claim 32, Applicant argues that (4) Cunningham does not teach or suggest enabling the user to define substitute nouns to replace automatically in one step all of the repeatedly used original nouns or other words or phrases or descriptions in all of the content for one or more of then events that are presented to the manager through a user interface. Regarding independent claim 16, Applicant argues that (5) neither Loofbourrow nor Cunningham alone or in combination teach or suggest enabling the manager to control interactively through the hardware display device which portion of the information is delivered and to indicate that the manager has read the portion of the information. Finally, Applicant argues that (6) all dependent claims are allowable as per arguments (1)-(5).

Regarding argument (1), it is moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Regarding argument (2), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Cunningham clearly teaches that a portion of the authored content is displayed on a hardware display device when the manager is currently working on one of the events associated with the portion of the authored content (par. 24, through "flows", reports (portion of data) can be sent to one or more users in a certain role (managers) under a specified condition. The example given of quantity of a stock item dropping below a threshold would be an event a manager was working on when a report was sent and displayed, par. 33, pop-up display).

Regarding argument (3), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Cunningham clearly teaches deriving a statistical measure of usage of particular information about the policies or programs (par. 88, if "next steps" are performed, then particular information was used. This usage is stored in an activity log, which constitutes a statistical measure of usage, and monitored by users, par. 121, summary pane of quantity and status of flow and goal instances, count is a statistical measure of usage, viewed, unviewed, critical, etc.). Additionally, Examiner notes that "for analysis to derive a statistical measure of usage of particular information about the policies or programs" constitutes intended use language, and will not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.

Regarding argument (4), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Cunningham clearly teaches enabling the user to define substitute nouns to replace automatically in one step all of the repeatedly used original nouns or other words or phrases or descriptions in all of the content for one or more of then events that are presented to the manager through a user interface (par. 44, 45, when an employee changes job, location, department, supervisor, etc. (repeatedly used original nouns), this change is inputted through the interface and replaces all instances automatically).

Regarding argument (5), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Cunningham clearly teaches enabling the manager to control interactively through the hardware display device which portion of the information is delivered and to indicate that the manager has read the portion of the information (par. 26, last sentence, a production manager is enabled to control that certain information be periodically sent to himself, par. 121, state indicator indicates whether or not the portion of information has been viewed).

Regarding argument (6), Examiner respectfully disagrees as per the responses to arguments (1)-(5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. **Claims 19-28 and 30-33 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Cunningham et al. (US 2007/0129953 A1).

Regarding claim 19, Cunningham teaches a computer-based method (par. 24, lines 1-2) comprising:

through a hardware input device, enabling a user to author content about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise, the content being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (par. 25, 39),

storing the authored content on a hardware storage device and in a manner that enables presentation of a portion of the authored content to a manager on a user interface displayed on a hardware display device when the manager is currently working on one of the events associated with the portion of the authored content (par. 24, 31), and

enabling a choice of which portion of the authored content will be presented based on a current context in which the manager is working (par. 24, through "flows", reports (portion of

data) can be sent to one or more users in a certain role (managers) under a specified condition. The example given of quantity of a stock item dropping below a threshold would be an event a manager was working on when a report was sent and displayed, par. 33, pop-up display).

Regarding claim 20, Cunningham teaches that the authored content is stored in a manner that enables the delivery of the authored content for a given event independently of the authored content for other events (par. 24, 25).

Regarding claim 21, Cunningham teaches that the user is enabled to author content for an event in a word-processing type interface that has a visual appearance like the one that is displayed to the manager (par. 31, 33).

Regarding claim 22, Cunningham teaches that the author is enabled to organize the authored content by event (par. 24, 31).

Regarding claim 23, Cunningham teaches a computer-readable medium bearing instructions to cause a machine (fig. 1) to:

through a hardware input device, enable a user to author content about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise, the content being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (par. 25, 39),

store the authored content on a hardware storage device and in a manner that enables presentation of a portion of the authored content to a manager on a user interface displayed on a hardware display device when the manager is currently working on one of the events associated with the portion of the authored content (par. 24, through "flows", reports (portion of data) can be sent to one or more users in a certain role (managers) under a specified condition. The

example given of quantity of a stock item dropping below a threshold would be an event a manager was working on when a report was sent and displayed, par. 33, pop-up display), and enable a choice of which portion of the content will be presented based on a current context in which the manager is working (par. 24).

Regarding claim 24, Cunningham teaches an apparatus (fig. 1) comprising:

a hardware input device displaying an authoring interface to enable a user (a) to author content about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise, the authored content being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise, (b) to store on a hardware storage device the authored content in a manner that enables presentation of the authored content to a manager on a user interface displayed on a hardware display device when the manager is currently working on one of the events associated with the portion of the authored content (par. 24, through "flows", reports (portion of data) can be sent to one or more users in a certain role (managers) under a specified condition. The example given of quantity of a stock item dropping below a threshold would be an event a manager was working on when a report was sent and displayed, par. 33, pop-up display), and (c) to enable a choice of which portion of the authored content will be presented based on a current context in which the manager is working (par. 24-26, 39).

Regarding claim 25, Cunningham teaches a computer-based method (par. 24, lines 1-2) comprising

accumulating in a hardware storage device information about usage by a manager within an enterprise of information about policies or programs of the enterprise that are to be

implemented by the manager, the policies or programs being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (par. 26), and

making the usage information available to a compliance employee of the enterprise for analysis to derive a statistical measure of usage of particular information about the policies or programs (par. 88, if "next steps" are performed, then particular information was used. This usage is stored in an activity log, which constitutes a statistical measure of usage, and monitored by users, par. 121, summary pane of quantity and status of flow and goal instances, count is a statistical measure of usage, viewed, unviewed, critical, etc.).

Regarding claim 26, Cunningham teaches that the usage information is made available as a compliance report displayed by a browser to the compliance employee (par. 26, par. 31).

Regarding claim 27, Cunningham teaches that the usage information is made available as a usage report (par. 26, par. 31).

Regarding claim 28, Cunningham teaches that the policies or programs information is organized by events in the operation of the enterprise, and the usage information includes a usage report that shows usage by managers according to the events (par. 25, 26, and 31).

Regarding claim 30, Cunningham teaches that the usage information is indicative of whether the manager has read the policies or programs information (par. 26, 86-88).

Regarding claim 31, Cunningham teaches a computer-readable medium bearing instructions to cause a machine (fig. 1) to:

accumulate on a hardware storage device information about usage by a manager of an enterprise of information about policies or programs of the enterprise that are to be implemented

by the manager, the policies or programs being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (par. 26), and

make the usage information available to a compliance employee of the enterprise for analysis to derive a statistical measure of usage of particular information about the policies or programs (par. 88, if "next steps" are performed, then particular information was used. This usage is stored in an activity log, which constitutes a statistical measure of usage, and monitored by users, par. 121, summary pane of quantity and status of flow and goal instances, count is a statistical measure of usage, viewed, unviewed, critical, etc.).

Regarding claim 32, Cunningham teaches a computer-based method (par. 7, lines 1-2) comprising:

through a hardware input device, enabling a user to author content about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise (par. 39), the content being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (par. 25, 26, and 55), the content for different events being authored and stored independently (par. 55), the content including original nouns or other words or phrases or descriptions that are used repeatedly and consistently (par. 44, department, job title, location and supervisor are used repeatedly and consistently), and

enabling the user to define substitute nouns to replace automatically in one step all of the repeatedly used original nouns or other words or phrases or descriptions in all of the content for one or more events that are presented to the manager through a user interface (par. 44, 45, when an employee changes job, location, department, supervisor, etc. (repeatedly used original nouns), this change is inputted through the interface and replaces all instances automatically).

Regarding claim 33, Cunningham teaches a computer-based method (par. 7, lines 1-2) comprising:

presenting on a hardware display device to a manager of the enterprise, information about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by the manager of the enterprise (par. 25, 26),

enabling the manager to confirm electronically that the manager has read the presented information (par. 26, 86-88), and

storing the electronic confirmation on a hardware storage device to allow a compliance employee of the enterprise to analyze a statistical measure of usage of particular information about the policies or programs (par. 88, if "next steps" are performed, then particular information was used. This usage is stored in an activity log, which constitutes a statistical measure of usage, and monitored by users, par. 121, summary pane of quantity and status of flow and goal instances, count is a statistical measure of usage, viewed, unviewed, critical, etc.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 1-8 and 10-18 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Loofbourrow et al. (US 6,505,183 B1) in view of Cunningham et al. (US 2007/0129953 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Loofbourrow teaches a computer-based method (par. 24, lines 1-2) comprising:

storing in a hardware storage device information about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise, the policies or programs being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (col. 4, lines 47-57), and

presenting to the manager on a user interface displayed on a hardware display device, a portion of the information that has been selected based on a current context in which the manager is working (col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 1-7).

Loofbourrow does not expressly teach enabling the manager, through the user interface, to implement management tasks for events that are associated with the presented portion of the information.

Cunningham teaches enabling the manager, through the user interface, to implement management tasks for events that are associated with the presented portion of the information (par. 86-88, "next steps" enable the manager to implement management tasks, such as ordering products, through the user interface).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to data management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage of including suggested actions with information, as taught by Cunningham (par. 86).

Regarding claim 2, Loofbourrow teaches the policies or programs are associated with human resources events (col. 4, lines 47-57, col. 5, lines 16-27).

Regarding claim 3, Loofbourrow teaches the current context comprises occurrence of one of the events (col. 4, lines 47-57).

Regarding claim 4, Loofbourrow teaches the event comprises a human resources event associated with an employee who reports to the manager (col. 4, lines 47-57).

Regarding claim 5, Loofbourrow teaches the current context comprises information associated with the manager (col. 4, lines 47-57).

Regarding claim 6, Loofbourrow teaches the information associated with the manager includes at least one of: the manager's responsibilities, the manager's experience, the manager's demographic characteristics, and characteristics of the employees that report to the manager (col. 4, lines 47-57).

Regarding claim 7, Loofbourrow teaches presenting the portion of the information

to the manager comprises serving the information through a web browser (col. 4, lines 34-46).

Regarding claim 8, Loofbourrow teaches enabling the manager to control interactively which portion of the information is presented (col. 5, lines 44-50).

Regarding claim 10, Loofbourrow does not teach that the portion of the information is associated with an action to be taken by the manager.

Cunningham teaches that the portion of the information is associated with an action to be taken by the manager (par. 25).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Regarding claim 11, Loofbourrow does not teach that the information includes descriptions of milestones associated with the action.

Cunningham teaches that the information includes descriptions of milestones associated with the action (par. 26).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have

combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Regarding claim 12, Loofbourrow does not teach that the information includes descriptions of tasks that are part of the action.

Cunningham teaches that the information includes descriptions of tasks that are part of the action (par. 25).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Regarding claim 13, Loofbourrow teaches the portion of the information includes information about employees who report to the manager (col. 4, lines 47-57).

Regarding claim 14, Loofbourrow does not teach enabling the manager to confirm that he has taken a required step with respect to the portion of the information.

Cunningham teaches enabling the manager to confirm that the manager has taken a required step with respect to the portion of the information (par. 55, 58, and 86-88).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Regarding claim 15, Loofbourrow does not teach that the required step comprises reading the portion of the information.

Cunningham teaches that the required step comprises reading the portion of the information (par. 55, 58, and 86-88).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded

predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Regarding claim 16, Loofbourrow teaches a computer-based method (par. 24, lines 1-2) comprising:

storing in a hardware storage device information about policies or programs of an enterprise that are associated with human resource events of employees who report to a manager and are to be implemented by the manager (col. 4, lines 47-57),

serving for display on a hardware display device to the manager through a web browser (col. 4, lines 34-46), a portion of the information that has been selected based on a current context in which the manager is working (col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 1-7, 44-50), and

the current context including at least one of: occurrence of one of the events, the manager's responsibilities, the manager's experience, and characteristics of the employees that report to the manager (col. 4, lines 47-57).

Loofbourrow does not teach:

the portion of the information being associated with an action to be taken by the manager, the information including at least one of: descriptions of milestones associated with the action, descriptions of tasks that are part of the action, or information about employees who report to the manager, and

enabling the manager to control interactively through the hardware display device which portion of the information is delivered and to indicate that the manager has read the portion of the information.

Cunningham teaches:

the portion of the information being associated with an action to be taken by the manager, the information including at least one of: descriptions of milestones associated with the action (par. 26), descriptions of tasks that are part of the action (par. 25), or information about employees who report to the manager, and

enabling the manager to control interactively through the hardware display device which portion of the information is delivered and to indicate that the manager has read the portion of the information (par. 26, last sentence, a production manager is enabled to control that certain information be periodically sent to himself, par. 121, state indicator indicates whether or not the portion of information has been viewed).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Regarding claim 17, Loofbourrow teaches a computer-readable medium bearing instructions to cause a machine (Fig. 1) to:

store in a hardware storage device information about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise, the policies or programs being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (col. 4, lines 47-57), and present to the manager on a user interface displayed on a hardware display device, a portion of the information that has been selected based on a current context in which the manager is working (col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 1-7).

Loofbourrow does not expressly teach enabling the manager, through the user interface, to implement management tasks for events that are associated with the presented portion of the information.

Cunningham teaches enabling the manager, through the user interface, to implement management tasks for events that are associated with the presented portion of the information (par. 86-88, "next steps" enable the manager to implement management tasks, such as ordering products, through the user interface).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to data management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings,

motivated by the advantage of including suggested actions with information, as taught by Cunningham (par. 86).

Regarding claim 18, Loofbourrow teaches an apparatus (Figure 1) comprising:

a hardware storage device to hold information about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise, the policies or programs being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (col. 4, lines 47-57), and

a communication medium to present to the manager on a user interface displayed on a hardware device, a portion of the information that has been selected based on a current context in which the manager is working (col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 1-7).

Loofbourrow does not expressly teach a feature of the user interface to enable the manager to implement management tasks on the events associated with the presented portion of the information.

Cunningham teaches a feature of the user interface to enable the manager to implement management tasks on the events associated with the presented portion of the information (par. 86-88, "next steps" enable the manager to implement management tasks, such as ordering products, through the user interface).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to data management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage of including suggested actions with information, as taught by Cunningham (par. 86).

14. **Claim 9 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loofbourrow et al. (US 6,505,183 B1) in view of Cunningham et al. (US 2007/0129953 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Official Notice.

Regarding claim 9, Loofbourrow teaches the information that is presented includes general information and policy statements (col. 6, lines 24-30).

Loofbourrow does not teach identifying the policy statements in a visually distinct way in the user interface.

Official notice is given that identifying the policy statements in a visually distinct way in the user interface was a matter of common knowledge to one skilled in the art at the time of applicant's invention. Some examples would include highlighting, bolding, larger text size, and different font.

All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Official Notice does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the well-known advantage of drawing attention to important information by making the information visually distinct and the teaching

in Loofbourrow of customizing the “look-and-feel” of the system interface, possibly by the inclusion of graphic (col. 5, lines 1-7).

15. **Claim 29 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cunningham et al. (US 2007/0129953 A1) as applied to claims 25 and 27 above, further in view of Loofbourrow et al. (US 6,505,183 B1).

Regarding claim 29, Cunningham does not teach that the events include human resources events.

Loofbourrow teaches that the events include human resources events (col. 2, lines 35-56).

The inventions of Cunningham and Loofbourrow pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Loofbourrow does not teach away from or contradict Cunningham, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jaime Cardenas-Navia whose telephone number is (571)270-1525. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10:30AM - 7:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bradley Bayat can be reached on (571) 272-6704. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

January 3, 2009

/J. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3624

/Bradley B Bayat/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3624